

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------|
| DOROTHY MURPHY, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. 08 C 2027 |
| |) | |
| FAIRMONT CARE CENTER, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |


SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORANDUM ORDER

This Court yesterday dismissed this action brought by pro se plaintiff Dorothy Murphy ("Murphy") because of the cumulative abuse that she had visited on the justice system by her conduct in this action, most recently by filing an Amended Complaint that impermissibly sought to divert the case from its origin as an employment discrimination lawsuit to a suit against Kenneth Henry ("Henry"), the lawyer for original defendant Fairmont Care Center ("Fairmont"). This supplement to yesterday's memorandum order is occasioned by matters disclosed by a just-taken computerized look at some of Murphy's earlier activity along the same lines.

Quite apart from (1) an apparent lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction over any suit that Murphy would seek to bring against Henry and (2) the likelihood that Henry would have immunity from such a suit in any event, it turns out that Murphy has twice before engaged in the same personal vendetta against Henry by suing him--in Case No. 08 C 860 (which was quickly dismissed for lack of jurisdiction) and Case No. 08 C 1410 (which

was dismissed as duplicative of 08 C 860), each of which cases had been assigned to this Court's colleague Honorable Blanche Manning. Indeed, in each of those two cases Murphy had also sued the trial bar lawyer who had previously been appointed to represent her pro bono publico in another of her lawsuits.¹

It thus appears that yesterday's memorandum order was, if anything, understated. Dismissal of this action was more than amply justified.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: August 14, 2008

¹ It will be recalled that the trial bar member whom this Court had appointed to represent Murphy in this case withdrew because she charged him with having conspired with opposing counsel (presumably Henry) and with defendant Fairmont. It seems that Murphy provides a strong confirmation of the proposition that "no good deed goes unpunished."